

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1121

to be the first President of Brazil elected by stealing the credit for achievements of the Alliance for Progress.

Senor Arraes' radical leftist supporters, who include the Brazilian Communist elite, have started a national campaign to make him the far-left candidate for President in 1965. Senor Arraes was first picked a year ago by Brazil's Communists as the man to get them into national power through the polls in 1970.

Their support helped him become mayor of Recife, Brazil's third largest city, in 1959, and Governor of Pernambuco in 1962. In recent weeks, they have speeded up by 5 years their plan to make him President.

HARD CAMPAIGN

A hard-hitting campaign, especially in the underdeveloped states of Brazil's northeast, far south, and far west, promotes Senor Arraes as the man who made Pernambuco's landlords quadruple the minimum farm wage. This actually means little, since most farm labor works on crop shares or on contract.

Senor Arraes' supporters claim that as part of his get-tough policy toward the United States, he abrogated all Alliance for Progress programs when he took office, then had his aggressive state officials harry the U.S. Agency for International Development for greater benefits.

AID spokesmen in Washington categorically deny this. AID assistance to Pernambuco has proceeded "without interruption and normally" since it first began, they say.

CREDIT GIVEN

The new Arraes-for-President drive gives him credit for improved social and economic conditions in Pernambuco that the Arraes government actually had only a minimal part in.

In most of the programs, U.S. loans or grants have directly financed the larger share. The Brazilian contribution has been split three ways—among a regional agency financed by Federal funds, by the Federal Government itself, and by the state government.

The United States loaned around \$200,000 for Recife's water system, for which Senor Arraes takes full credit. AID financed over half of a \$1.5 million low-cost housing project that provides 700 new homes for Recife, and over half of a \$3 million literacy campaign affecting 100,000 adults.

OVER HALF

The United States also provided more than half the financing for a \$1 million Pernambuco health program, \$9 million of a \$20 million industrial development project, nearly 66 percent of a \$200,000 water supply improvement program, and 25 percent of a \$4.8 million homesteaders project.

The new AID-sparked activity has brought hundreds of millions of new cruzeiros, many new jobs and greatly increased purchasing power into Recife. Even a U.S. national weekly recently lauded Senor Arraes for this without mentioning the significance of the AID program.

The Baltic Republics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I have always had the greatest admiration for the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. I have many friends, espe-

cially in my district who have come from these countries, particularly Estonia, since the Soviet seizure. They have become splendid American citizens, proud of their heritage and proud of their adopted country.

The great American melting pot has performed its wonders and they and their children are and will be very important segments of the American scene, and yet it is so important that we do not forget that these three great nations are not Russian. As time goes on, I am fearful that this will be forgotten. It is therefore important that action be taken on my House Resolution 375, as well as the resolutions of many of my colleagues, setting up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Along this line a recent editorial in the New York Times is noteworthy. It is entitled, "Freedom in the Baltic," and follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1964]

FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC

A forceful reminder that Soviet Russia, which has written "anticolonialism" on its propaganda banners, is today the biggest colonial power in the world is provided by two nations which faithfully and hopefully observe their independence days this month though now reduced to Russian colonies. They are the Baltic States, Lithuania and Estonia, which together with Latvia, shook off the Russian yoke after the First World War only to become again victims of Russian imperialism in the Second.

Their hopes for regaining their liberty are sustained by their continued recognition as independent nations by the United States and other Western Powers. But they live between hope and fear. The growing independence of the East European satellites appears to inspire a new urge for freedom in the Baltic States as well, especially in the youth no longer cowed by Stalinist terror. But the growing Russification of their homelands makes it a close race between national survival and national extinction.

Results of a Weak Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the February 20, 1964, issue of the Buffalo Times Herald. The editorial is as follows:

RESULTS OF A WEAK FOREIGN POLICY

It appears that the United States is reaping the reward for its weak, almost fawning foreign policy.

Through a good number of years since the end of World War II, we have been so anxious to please that we have shared our production and our financial might with nations, allies and avowed enemies alike, across the face of the globe. In almost every case as soon as we have strengthened the recipients of our taxpayers' largesse to the point where they began to feel self-sufficiency, they have turned on us in one fashion or another. Nevertheless we have gone blindly on, forcing our charity upon them in many ways, in many instances buy-

ing luxuries for foreign heads of state while our national debt built up to the point where we are the most indebted people in history.

We have been so anxious to appease that we have allowed ourselves to negotiate away our position as a world leader in commerce as well as in free world policy. In recent weeks we have been threatened in Cuba, we have been threatened in Panama despite our honorable treaty rights. We have been sharply rebuffed by the British in regard to trade with Cuba. We have been placed in a bad position in Laos and in Cyprus, both areas where many believe we have no business under the circumstances.

In our eagerness to establish a one-world policy of trade, we have placed domestic producers at the mercy of foreign competition, which in many cases is directly subsidized by the very producers who are losing the domestic market. What chance have our cattlemen, for instance, of competing on the worldwide market when American products are subject to restrictions not imposed on products imported into this country? What chance have we of influencing our allies not to trade with Cuba while we rush to trade with Russia. This is no more sensible than trying to keep the kids from playing with the bear cubs while we pet and feed the papa bear. Why should we be so naive as to expect the Reds to pay for shipments of wheat in money and good will? How much have we received of our lend-lease which played such an important part in setting Russia's feet on the path to world domination?

There are many things about world trade and world diplomacy that we do not know. However there are a few facts about human behavior with which we are familiar:

1. The best neighbors are those who share a well-kept fence.

2. You don't gain the respect or confidence of a man who has promised to blow your house up by going his note at the bank to buy dynamite from you at wholesale. All you will earn is a reputation for being a sucker.

3. When you guarantee to help support all your neighbors whether you have anything for yourself or not, you are automatically headed for trouble.

Can it be that dealing with people in the millions is so much different from dealing with them individually that all basic rules of human behavior must be ignored?

It has been well demonstrated that when Uncle Sam stands up for his rights the entire world respects him. Why then, must he continually come out on the short end in conference table negotiations?

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the Jewish community within the Soviet Union is suffering under increasing persecution. In connection with this appalling situation, the Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit recently adopted the following resolution for which I take this opportunity to put it into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The Delegate Assembly of the Jewish Community Council, composed of representatives

March 4

A1122

of 340 Jewish member organizations in the metropolitan Detroit area, deplores the continuing perpetration of cultural and religious genocide against Jews in the Soviet Union by the Soviet Government. Official restrictions imposed upon the 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union deny to them their freedom of worship, isolate them from their tradition and from their coreligionists in other parts of the world, and destroy their specifically Jewish spirit.

Prohibitions against the making or importation of Jewish religious objects—of prayer shawls, phylacteries, prayerbooks, Bibles, religious calendars—and against maintaining spiritual ties with coreligionists abroad, are indications of the harsh and restrictive discriminatory measures. Jewish religious and cultural life is further circumscribed by restrictions against the Yiddish theater and press, religious schools, publishing of books in Yiddish and Hebrew. Traditional burial is proscribed and much anguish is occasioned by the suffering thus imposed.

All of these restrictions are in contradistinction to the status accorded to other nationality and religious minorities resident in the Soviet Union.

We, therefore, call upon the Soviet authorities to implement their often repeated concern for, and championship of, freedom for all nationalities and groups, by according to Soviet Jews the same status and conditions enjoyed by other groupings of Soviet citizens, and to restore to the U.S.S.R.'s Jewish citizens their rights to:

1. Jewish education in all its forms.
2. Continuity of Jewish cultural life through literature, theater, schools, press, publishing houses, and other forms of cultural expression in Yiddish and in Hebrew.
3. Reopening of synagogues to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry.
4. Jewish ritual observance in its traditional forms.
5. Reestablishment of religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad.
6. Be reunited with their families in other lands, from whom they have been separated.

We appeal to the Soviet Government—as a matter of urgency and elementary decency—to recognize the rights of Jews to their own language, religious and cultural expression to the degree permitted all other ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

Our call also goes out to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to use his good offices and the machinery of this world body, of which the Soviet Union is a member nation, to act against the cultural and religious genocide being perpetrated against Soviet Jewry.

We also call upon the Government of the United States, our President, our Secretary of State, our Congressman and our Ambassador to the United Nations, to protest to the Soviet Government through diplomatic and other channels, against the oppressions herein detailed.

The officers of the Jewish Community Council are instructed to send copies of this resolution to the officials above mentioned and to take all appropriate measures to the accomplishment of these ends, independently and in concert with national agencies and other like-minded groups.

Is History About To Repeat Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think our world prestige has ever

been lower than it is today and, yet, the Johnson administration persists in its policy of appeasement. David Lawrence, in the February 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report, tells us how history may yet repeat itself, if we do not stand firm so that we can regain some of the respect which we have lost and are still losing, by our present anemic policy:

DEFINING THE "COLD WAR"

(By David Lawrence)

History sometimes repeats itself. In 1937, the Western Allies refused to heed the pleas of President Franklin D. Roosevelt that aggressors be quarantined. Previous proposals that an economic blockade be imposed on the Fascist dictators also failed to secure allied support. Disunity in the West and policies of appeasement furnished the basis for the miscalculation by Hitler that brought on World War II.

Today our principal allies—Great Britain and France—are deaf to our pleas for unity in the Western Alliance. The British Government insists on furnishing economic help to Castro's Cuba. The French Government, also motivated by a desire for trade, openly embraces the aggressor government in Red China. Appeasement is in the air again.

At the very time that Castro defies the United States—as he cuts off the water supply for the Guantanamo Naval Base—the British Prime Minister arrives in Washington and, after conferences with the President, announces to the press that Great Britain is to extend long-term credits to Russia and will continue to trade with Cuba.

It is time to make clear to our allies what the cold war really means. For it is a worldwide war being waged by the Communist government in Moscow with the object of subverting and overthrowing democratic governments everywhere.

We are too often inclined to regard the doctrine of "communism" itself as the sole evil. But, actually, communism is an effective instrument, a tool, in the hands of tyrannical and unscrupulous rulers. Irrespective of what economic philosophy may be fostered, the fact remains that communism is being utilized to overthrow governments established by free peoples everywhere and to bring those countries within the Soviet orbit.

We are often importuned to pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence with the Moscow Government—by which is meant that we are expected to tolerate subversion and infiltration.

We cannot safely coexist, however, with a government whose aim is to overthrow us.

Just 30 years ago, we formally recognized the Soviet Government, and the record since then has shown repeated violation of pledges given us at that time. Attempts at infiltration and subversion by the Communists have been frequent.

Our own Government, under this and preceding administrations, has striven to maintain a military peace. But, at the same time, we have been confronted with threats from missile bases which the Communists erected after they conquered our neighbor, the Cuban Republic.

We must not flounder in the cold war. We should carry on the fight vigorously every day. And we can do so only by telling the truth incessantly to the Russian people and to the whole world.

We know the hostile purpose of the Soviet Government toward us—it is evident in acts recorded nearly every month of the year. We should not gloss over these happenings as mere "distresses"—the word that President Johnson used a few days ago.

We have witnessed violations of written and oral agreements by the Soviets. There is no way we can coexist with a dishonest and treacherous government.

Military force is an effective weapon, and we need to be militarily prepared in every

way. But this is not the only force available to us. Psychological warfare—especially through the constant employment of moral force—is equally important.

The most effective form of communication in the world is by word of mouth. Our story can be told in dozens of ways so that it will gradually reach the people of the Soviet Union.

The social doctrines of communism constitute the biggest barrier to economic progress today for the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Their opportunities to achieve the standards of living of the free countries of the world are being frustrated by the practitioners of communism in the Kremlin.

We are not the enemies of the Russian people. We are not concerned with what ideological views they may choose to express. But we do know that there can be no peace in the world while an autocratic government—unfriendly to us—is in power in the Soviet Union.

Although we will have these intervals of so-called peace, we must face the fact that, as long as a dictatorship prevails in the Soviet Union, the people of the United States will never be certain from day to day whether or not a military conflict will emerge, either in a limited war or a nuclear war.

Our enemy is Communist imperialism. It is directed by men who do not believe in God and hence do not believe in morality or in common honesty.

Neither we nor our allies should appease the Communists, or we shall again find ourselves in the middle of a major war.

Elizabeth Parkhurst, Connecticut Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year's winner of the annual Voice of Democracy contest in the State of Connecticut is a young woman from my congressional district, Miss Elizabeth Parkhurst, of Chestnut Hill. He is a junior at Lyman Memorial High School in Lebanon, Conn.

The Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Miss Parkhurst will be the guest of that organization in Washington during the annual meetings of its department commanders March 7-10, and she will attend the congressional banquet on March 10 at which time the national winners will be announced. The commander of the Connecticut Department, VFW, is Frank A. Sturges, Jr. Needless to say, that I plan to attend and hope that our State entry will emerge as the national winner.

In the meantime, I am very pleased to insert into the RECORD Miss Parkhurst's speech, entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship," which I desire to bring to the attention of all my colleagues. Connecticut is very proud of this young lady and the views she expresses. Her speech is as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Elizabeth Parkhurst)

The word "citizenship" refers to the state of being a citizen, that is, being entitled to